For the Northern District of California

Plaintiff, v. NETFLIX, INC., et al., Defendants.	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT AS LEAD PLAINTIFF AND APPROVAL OF SELECTION OF COUNSEL (Docket No. 12)
MARTIN SCHULTHES,	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA No. C-13-0712 EMC
	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Plaintiff Martin Schulthes has filed a class action complaint, asserting a violation of the Securities Exchange Act (including Rule 10b-5) by Defendants Netflix, Inc.; Reed Hastings; and David Wells. Pursuant to the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act ("PSLRA"), Mr. Schulthes has filed a motion for appointment as lead plaintiff and approval of selection of counsel. The Court deems this matter suitable for disposition without oral argument. Having considered the papers submitted, including the supplemental briefing provided by Mr. Schulthes, the Court hereby **DENIES** the motion without prejudice.

As Mr. Schulthes concedes, under 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(3)(I), before appointment of a lead plaintiff may take place, the plaintiff must give early notice of, *inter alia*, the pendency of the action to members of the purported class "in a widely circulated national business-oriented publication or wire service." 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(3)(A)(I). Here, Mr. Schulthes gave notice via an entity by the name of *PRBuzz*. The Court ordered Mr. Schulthes to provide supplemental briefing and/or evidence to support his claim that *PRBuzz* is a widely circulated national business-oriented wire

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

service. It also asked Mr. Schulthes to identify any ruling by a federal court finding PRBuzz to be such a service for purposes of the PSLRA. See Docket No. 15 (order).

Mr. Schulthes filed his supplemental papers on May 31, 2013. See Docket No. 18 (supplemental brief). In his papers, he does not identify any federal court ruling finding PRBuzz to be a widely circulated national business-oriented wire service. He argues, however, that PRBuzz constitutes such a service based on (1) claims made by PRBuzz on its website and (2) "a partial listing of the websites that published the notice." Docket No. 18 (Supp. Br. at 2).

The Court finds this argument unavailing. Neither the claims made by *PRBuzz* on its website or the "partial listing" of websites provided by Mr. Schulthes establishes that PRBuzz is a businessoriented wire service, as required by the PSLRA. Compare, e.g., Westley v. Oclaro, No. C-11-2448 EMC, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 102249, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 12, 2011) (noting that "[m]ultiple courts have recognized Business Wire as a widely circulated national business-oriented wire service").

Moreover, the claims made by *PRBuzz* on its website are either unsupported (e.g., that its press releases reach thousands) or do not give any real sense of whether the investing public – or more particularly, large, experienced investors – would be likely to see the press releases made available by PRBuzz to its alleged partners. For instance, even if the companies listed on PRBuzz's website have in the past published some of PRBuzz's press releases, there is no information as to how often they have relied on *PRBuzz*.

As for the "partial listing" supplied by Mr. Schulthes, the Court notes that the press release/notice appears to have been distributed and picked up by fewer than forty entities.

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27

///

28 ///

Accordingly, the Court finds that there is insufficient evidence to establish that <i>PRBuzz</i> is a
widely circulated national business-oriented wire service. Because there is insufficient evidence to
establish such, Mr. Schulthes's motion for appointment as lead plaintiff and approval of counsel
must be denied. The denial is without prejudice.
This order disposes of Docket No. 12.
IT IS SO ORDERED.
Dated: June 10, 2013